



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE RURAL SOUTH.*

BY JOHN LEE COULTER, PH.D., *Expert Special Agent, Bureau of the Census.*

Probably no greater change has taken place in the agricultural conditions of any other part of this country during the last half century than that which has come over the South. The change is doubtless as great or greater than that which has taken place in any country at any period in such a few years. The immediate cause of the change was doubtless the freeing of the Negroes who had been slaves. I know nothing of the merits of the controversy which led up to that event, except in so far as I have read history or have talked with veterans of the Union and Confederate armies, because the feeling which continued for some time after the war had disappeared almost entirely before I was old enough to understand the meaning of the conflict, and further because both of my parents came to the United States several years after the close of the war. I shall not, therefore, devote any time to the immediate cause of the change in the rural conditions of the South, but I shall tell of some of the features of the change, try to interpret their significance, compare present conditions with those of other parts of the United States, and point to some of the present tendencies.

I desire first to limit the field in order that I may more easily deal with the subject. I have, therefore, chosen to consider the movement in only eight states: namely, the old Southern States east of the Mississippi River, including Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky and Virginia. I have limited the area in this way in order to eliminate the range and cattle question and the newer developments in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas, as well as the fruit and small vegetable movement in Florida and similar features in other neighboring states. It seemed to me that the area chosen would best illustrate

*Paper presented at the joint meeting of the American Economic Association and the American Statistical Association, Washington, D. C., December 28, 1911.

the movement in the old South. What I have to say concerning the area considered would, of course, apply equally well to sections of some of the other states. I wish, as a starting point, to give special attention to the status of the eight states in question as it existed in 1860 and compare it with conditions at different dates during the last fifty years.

The first thing to consider, concerning these eight states, is the all-important fact that their aggregate population in 1860 was 7,994,000, whereas in 1910 it was 16,802,000. This is an increase in fifty years of almost exactly 100 per cent. In contrast to this, the amount of land in farms in these states was 161,607,000 in 1860 and 163,921,000 in 1910. This is a net increase of only 2,314,000 acres, or 1.4 per cent. It is worth while to note that the total land area of these states is 228,945,000 acres. The land in farms, therefore, at the present time is 71.6 per cent. of the total land area as compared with 70.6 per cent. fifty years ago. Thus, while population doubled during the half century, there was practically no change in the amount of land in farms. There have been increases in some sections of all of these states, but they have been offset by decreases found in the rough mountainous areas where large tracts of land have reverted to forest or have been taken from agriculture and are now reported as mineral lands. There are also many thousands of acres of coast land which formerly were used for rice cultivation or other purposes, but which have, at least temporarily, passed out of the class "agricultural land." Some land, too, because of long years of use and deterioration has temporarily passed out of cultivation. The net change in fifty years is only 1.5 per cent.

In spite of the fact that the amount of land in farms has changed but little, there has been an increase in the number of farms from 504,000 to 1,948,000. Thus, there are now almost four times as many farms as there were in 1860. It must be very clear from this that the size of the average farm has *decreased* in proportion to the *increase* in the number of farms. The average farm as reported in 1860 was 321 acres, while now it is 84 acres. This, then, is the change: the amount of farm land increased but slightly, but the number of farms

increased fourfold, with the result that the average farm is about one fourth as large as the average farm 50 years ago. It is evident then that whereas there were 63 farms per 1,000 of population in these states in 1860, there are now nearly twice that many (116).

Turning now to a consideration of the improved land in farms, which after all is more important from some standpoints than the total area of land in farms, it is significant to note that there has been a constant, quite gradual although decided increase in the proportion of farm land improved. In 1860 only 33.5 per cent. of all land in farms was improved. This amounted to 33.9 per cent. in 1870 and 36.7 per cent. in 1880. The absolute amount of land improved was 54,135,000 acres in 1860. In 1870 it had decreased to 47,485,000 acres, a decrease of 6,650,000 acres, or 12.3 per cent. But by 1880 the amount of improved land had increased to 58,149,000 acres, which is almost 4,000,000 acres above the amount in farms in 1860. It is clear, therefore, that it was not until about 1880 that the South had completely recovered from the war, so far as bringing land into cultivation was concerned.

But other remarkable changes were taking place. During the first 20 years of the period I am considering the revolution in land tenure had gotten well under way. The number of farms had more than doubled in that period,—notwithstanding the fact that the amount of land improved had remained constant,—and the average amount of improved land per farm was just one half what it had been 20 years before.

Since 1880 the movement has continued. The improved land was 36.7 per cent. of all land in farms in 1880; it amounted to 42.4 per cent. in 1890, 45.7 per cent. in 1900 and 49.4 per cent. in 1910. Thus, the improved land in farms was just one third of all land in farms half a century ago, whereas now it is almost exactly one half of all farm land. During this same period there has been a downward movement in the average amount of land of all kinds per farm and in the average amount of improved lands per farm. The number of farms doubled in the first 20 years,—from 1860 to 1880,—and it has almost doubled again in the last 30 years, increasing from

1,078,000 to 1,948,000. The average acreage per farm of all land now is 84, and of improved land 42.

The agricultural movement was much alike in all of the eight states, although more pronounced in some than in others. I shall not attempt to compare the states or to compare one section of any state with other sections. A comparison of conditions in a group of some 250 counties with all other counties in these states would have brought out in an even more pronounced way the revolution which has taken place. Suffice it to say here, that while at the present time approximately 50 per cent. of the land is improved in this entire group of states, it exceeds 50 per cent. in Kentucky and Tennessee, is just 50 per cent. in Virginia, and ranges from 40 to 50 per cent. in the other states. The opportunity for further development is very evident. Assuming that the average farm continues to contain about 40 acres of improved land, and that all of the land in farms could be brought into use, there is still room to double the number of farms in these states even if no more land were brought into farms.

In average amount of land per farm and improved land per farm, the status of the different states corresponds closely to the status of the whole group. The average amount of improved land per farm for the entire group is about 42 acres. It slightly exceeds 50 acres in Kentucky and Virginia, and falls below 40 acres in North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi.

VALUE OF FARM PROPERTY.

Before discussing in detail the number of farms by size groups, the tenure of these farms, and the amount expended for labor, I desire to present briefly a statement of the value of farm land and buildings, and equipments in the eight states. The total value of farm property,—which includes the land, buildings, implements and machinery, and live stock,—was given in 1860 as \$2,048,000,000 in round numbers. The effects of the war are clearly evident when I state that in 1870 the total value reported was only slightly more than one half of this amount (\$1,137,000,000). Recovery was

slow. In 1880 the total value was reported as \$1,486,000,000. In 1890 another gain had taken place and the total amount reported was \$1,875,000,000. It was not until 1900 that the total value of farm property was reported at about the same as the amount given in 1860. Indeed, even in 1900 the total value (\$2,135,000,000) was only about 4 per cent. above that reported 40 years before. During all of this time a constant and large increase in farm values had taken place in the United States as a whole. Between 1860 and 1870, there was an increase of approximately \$1,000,000,000 and between 1870 and 1890 the total value had almost doubled, increasing from less than \$9,000,000,000 to slightly more than \$16,000,000,000. From 1860 to 1900 the value of farm property in the United States, as a whole, increased from \$7,980,000,000 to \$20,439,-000,000, or 156 per cent.; whereas in this group of eight Southern States there was an increase of only 4 per cent. Thus it required this entire period to recover from the destruction wrought during the early sixties.

If, however, the increase was slow during the first three decades after the war, this cannot be said of the last ten years. Between 1900 and 1910 the total value of farm property in this group of eight Southern States more than doubled, showing an increase from \$2,135,000,000 to \$4,318,000,000, or 102 per cent. as compared with 100.5 per cent. for the United States. The rates of increase varied slightly from state to state, but for the whole group of eight states, the increases and decreases are fairly constant.

What I said of "all farm property" could have been said in almost the same words concerning each class of farm property. The total value of the land and buildings decreased nearly 50 per cent. between 1860 and 1870, and in 1900 had only slightly exceeded the value attained in 1860. Implements and machinery decreased in the same way, but by 1900 the value quite decidedly exceeded that in 1860, although in 1890 it had not recovered. In the case of live stock the total value fell off in the same way between 1860 and 1870. There were material increases in each decade from this time, and in 1900 the total value just exceeded the total value reported in 1860.

F FARMS BY SIZE GROUPS.

One of the most significant pieces of information available, is obtained through the classification of farms in these states by size groups. At each census it is possible to divide the total amount of land in farms by the total number of farms, and in that way arrive at the average size per farm. This is very unsatisfactory because at best a very few large farms raise the average size very materially, and entirely conceal the fact that there were present great numbers of comparatively small farms. I noted above that in 1860 the average size of farms in this group of states was 321 acres. In 1870 it was 212 acres. It is clear that the remarkable change which I have indicated began between 1860 and 1870 and that during this time large numbers of small farms were established. The census of 1860 reported a total of 503,758 farms in the eight states. These farms were distributed according to size groups, but for some reason not known to me the total number so distributed (455,980) is only about 90 per cent. of the total number of farms that actually existed in these states. This distribution is, however, extremely significant and shows the movement clearly. In 1860 there were under 10,000 farms reported to be less than 10 acres in size; in 1870 the number was over 56,000, or an increase of 471 per cent. The increase in number of farms from 10 to 20 acres in size was about from 32,000 to 91,000, or 179 per cent.; that in farms from 20 to 50 acres was from 128,000 to 225,000, or 76.4 per cent.; and that in farms from 50 to 100 acres was from 121,000 to 149,000, or 23 per cent. By far the greatest relative increases were in the smaller size groups. The total increase recorded in all farms below 100 acres was from 291,400 to 521,700, or nearly 100 per cent. Of course this meant that the plantation of 1860 was being rapidly subdivided into small plots of land, each of which was cultivated under the direction of the owner and called a farm. The number of farms between 100 and 500 acres in size *decreased* from 147,000 to 130,000, or 11.6 per cent.; those between 500 and 1,000 acres from 13,350 to 7,740, or 43.7 per cent.; and those over 1,000 acres in size from 3,769 to 1,734, or 54 per cent. Here, again,

we have evidence of the breaking-down process which accounts for the decrease in average size of farm from 321 to 212 acres mentioned above. It should be noted in passing that probably the census of 1870 was defective in many respects and that some holdings were overlooked. It is also clear, however, that many plantations were entirely unworked and, therefore, not reported.

The great change from 1870 to 1880 marked a continuation of the breaking-down or splitting-up process. The average size of farm decreased from 212 to 147 acres, or 31 per cent. This, of course, was due to the increase in number of farms reported from 661,227 to 1,078,355, or 63.1 per cent., while the land area in farms increased only 13.2 per cent. It is best not to compare too closely the change in number of farms by size groups for this decade, because one was based on improved land per farm, while the other was on all land per farm.

Prior to 1880 no data are available showing the number of farms operated by tenants as compared with the number operated by owners. In spite of the absence of exact statistical information, it is possible to draw some conclusion from the facts already given. In 1860 the plantation was the unit over a considerable area in these Southern States. The entire plantation was reported as one farm. This is the reason for the high average size of farms. By 1870 the planters were forced to completely change their system of securing labor. Instead of slavery, hired labor or a tenancy system was necessary. Both of these were attempted. Since the average size of farm decreased from 321 to 147 acres,—*i.e.* the average farm was considerably less than one half that of 1860,—it is evident that over large areas the *tenancy* system was being rapidly introduced and the plantation being divided into small “cuts of land.” Each “parcel” of land was worked by a *tenant*. This, then, was a substitute for the hired labor system in the Northern States, and although the workers were called tenants, croppers, renters, halvers, standing renters, etc., very often they were as closely supervised as hired laborers and performed only the physical labor, as the plans of work were entirely drawn up by the owners of the land. Although

tenancy was increasing rapidly, the tenant in the area under consideration was not strictly comparable to a tenant on the Northern farms, but was a substitute for the hired laborer of that region. In 1870 and in all later censuses, however, each of these parcels of land was recognized as a farm, and each family as a farm-family, and the head of it as a farmer. The fact that the number of farms increased considerably more than 100 per cent. between 1860 and 1880 means that the census recognized each of these small subdivisions of the plantations as a unit rather than the plantation itself.

Beginning with 1880, facts are available in regard to the number of farms by size groups and the number of tenants contrasted with the number of owners. An analysis of these facts throws a flood of light on the situation. At the census of 1880 there were reported for the eight states over 44,000 places less than 10 acres in size. Since 1880 the number has constantly increased until in 1910 there are almost three times as many: namely 118,000. The next group of farms is from 10 to 20 acres in size. In 1880 about 100,000 such were reported, whereas at the present time there are nearly 245,000. In this class of farms there has been a consistent and rapid increase, amounting to nearly 150 per cent. in 30 years. Still more important is the group of farms between 20 and 50 acres in size of which there were 252,000 in 1880, as against 656,000 in 1910. The number of farms between 50 and 100 acres likewise increased, although not nearly so rapidly as the number in the other size groups mentioned, the increase being from 222,000 to 428,000 during the 30 years under consideration. It is unfortunate that the next size group is so large, including as it does all farms from 100 to 500 acres. The increase in the number of farms from 100 to 200 is so great that a net increase is shown in the 30-year period in the total number of farms between 100 and 500 acres; the increase, however, is only from 409,000 to 474,000. Indeed, an absolute decrease in farms of that size is taking place at the present time, which during the last 10 years has resulted in a diminution of 18,500 farms. This shows that the large farms (or if we may still speak of them as "plantations") continue to be divided

into smaller parcels of land operated by tenants or small farmers.

This fact becomes even more apparent when we note the number of farms between 500 and 1,000 acres in size. In 1880, although large numbers of plantations had been subdivided into smaller parcels of land operated by tenants, there were still 37,000 of them reported. But in 1890 their number had decreased to about 33,000; by 1900 to 24,000; and in 1910 there were only 20,000 plantations of between 500 and 1,000 acres. This striking movement which clearly indicates a continued subdivision of these large places, becomes even more notable when we observe the movement in the number of places over 1,000 acres in size. In 1880 there remained 14,000 such holdings, probably properly called "plantations." They were gradually reduced. By 1890 their number was less than 12,000. In 1900 it was about 7,900, while by 1910 it had decreased until it is less than 6,700.

Briefly stated, the whole movement during the half century under consideration shows that the amount of land in farms has not changed greatly. The real movement has been a change in the method of carrying on the work of producing crops. In 1860 the common system in the Northern States was, where the farm-family could not do all the work, to employ hired labor, while on many plantations in the South, the labor was performed by slaves. After the war, instead of establishing the hired labor system prevailing in the Northern States a change was made to a system under which each laboring family was not hired at a definite wage but assigned to a piece of land and given part of the crop as compensation for his labor. No greater mistake has been made in collecting data concerning agricultural conditions than that of not securing information about the number of actual owners of land and the amount owned. Beginning with 1870 the reports show more nearly the number of farm-families. There has been no parallel presentation showing the movement of the number of plantations. The first attempt to secure data, recognizing both units, is that undertaken by the Census Bureau in 1910. Although the results will not be complete for the entire South,

this will show as far as possible for the old plantation area the extent to which the plantation still exists and the number and extent of the holdings as contrasted with the number of small units or parcels of land operated by farm-families.

In order to indicate more clearly the actual movement in the Southern States as contrasted with other parts of the United States, it is worth while to note that the census of 1910 shows that of all farmers slightly more than 66 per cent. of those in Mississippi, nearly 66 per cent. of those in Georgia, 63 per cent. of those in South Carolina, and over 60 per cent. of those in Alabama are worked by tenants. In these four states, there are 642,000 of these parcels of land operated by tenants. In North Carolina and Tennessee, to the north of the four states just considered, more than 40 per cent. of the farms enumerated are worked by tenants; in Kentucky 34 per cent. and in Virginia almost 27 per cent. are so worked. The ten states which have the largest percentage of tenancy are Southern States, but this tenancy is quite different from the tenancy in the Northern States.

Between 1880 and 1910 there has been a considerable increase in the number of farm owners. In 1880 there were 672,000 owners and managers, whereas in 1910 there were 961,000, an increase of 289,000, or 43 per cent. On the other hand, there were only 407,000 tenants in 1880, less than two thirds as many as owners and managers, while in 1910 there were 987,000, which is considerably more than the total number of farmers who own either all or part of their land, or who are hired managers. The increase was 580,000, or 143 per cent.

In 1880 the value of "all farm property" per acre of farm land was \$9.37. By 1890 it was \$11.78, an increase of \$2.41 per acre, or over 25 per cent. During that decade there was an increase of 169,499 farms, or 15.7 per cent., the owners increasing only 74,212, or 11 per cent., while the tenants increased 95,237, or 23.4 per cent. It would seem that with advancing land values ownership becomes more difficult. By 1900 the average value of all farm property per acre of farm land was \$13.00 an increase of only \$1.22, or 10.4 per cent.

But the increase in number of farms amounted to 428,078, or 34.3 per cent. As farm values continued to increase, so a smaller part of the increase in number of farms was among owners. Owners increased 120,868, or 16.2 per cent., while tenants increased 307,210, or 61.2 per cent. The same movement continues. The number of farms increased 271,802, or 16.2 per cent., during the last decade, the owners increasing only 93,826, or 10.8 per cent., while the tenants increased 177,976, or 22 per cent. The average value of all farm property per acre of farm land increased from \$13.00 to \$26.34, or more than 100 per cent. during the same period.

If it is unfortunate that no data are available prior to 1880 showing the number of farms by size-groups and number of farmers classed as tenants as contrasted with owners and managers; it is even more unfortunate that the number of farms operated by white farmers was not separated from those operated by Negroes. In 1900 the first data covering this point were collected and they show that in this group of eight states one third of the farms were operated by colored farmers, and two thirds by white farmers; further that of the colored farmers only about one fifth were owners, while among the white farmers nearly two thirds lived on owned farms. Here, again, we have clear evidence that the system of tenancy established as a substitute for hired labor applies much more largely to colored than to white farmers. In 1900 there were more than 400,000 Negro tenants in these states. In 1910 the number had increased to considerably more than 500,000. During the decade there was an increase in the total number of farms, amounting to 271,802, or 16.2 per cent. The increase in the number of whites was 149,277, or 13.1 per cent., while that of Negroes was 122,525, or 22.9 per cent., showing that Negro farmers are increasing at a greater rate than the white.

As noted above, the total increase in number of farms was 271,802. Of these 149,277, or 54.9 per cent., were white farmers and 122,525, or 45.1 per cent., Negroes. On the other hand, the increase in number of owners was 93,826 and of these 70,004, or 74.6 per cent., were whites, and only 23,822, or 25.4 per cent., Negroes.

Probably the best evidence that the small farm and tenant system in the South is a substitute for the hired labor system on the Northern farms is brought out in an investigation of the extent to which farmers employ labor in different parts of the United States. An analysis of the report for 1909 shows that two thirds of the farmers in the New England and Middle Atlantic States employ hired labor. In the North Central and in the Mountain and Pacific States more than one half of the farmers employ hired labor. In contrast to this scarcely one third of the farmers in all of the Southern States employ labor. For the group of states on which I have reported, about 36 per cent. hire labor. This high average is due to the fact that in Virginia 46 per cent. report labor employed and North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia each show almost 40 per cent. The most interesting feature of this analysis is the fact that the change of the system from "hired labor" to "small farm and tenant" can be traced as gradual from one extreme of the country to the other. Thus, in Massachusetts, in the New England division, 72.5 per cent. of all farmers report hired labor, and they report an expenditure of \$452 per farm. This gradually decreases as one proceeds South until Virginia is reached where 46 farmers out of every hundred report hired labor, with an expenditure of \$158 per farm. In North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, 39 out of every hundred employed labor, with an average expenditure per farm ranging from \$95 to \$166. Alabama is next in order where less than 32 out of every hundred report any expenditure for labor, and Mississippi follows with only 24 farmers out of every hundred reporting. Mississippi, which shows the lowest percentage of farms reporting expenditures for labor (23.9 per cent.), has the highest percentage of tenancy (66.1 per cent.). Massachusetts on the other hand, with only 8.1 per cent. of tenancy, shows 73 farms out of every hundred as reporting labor.

It is not only a fact that the tenant system is a substitute for the hired labor system in other parts of the country, but that in these Southern States the farmers who report expenditures for labor state an exceedingly small amount. In the

New England and Middle Atlantic States an average expenditure of about \$260 per farm for labor is maintained, while in the North Central States the average runs well over \$225. In the Mountain and Pacific States it amounts to \$600 per farm. In contrast, the average in the Southern States is considerably less than \$150, indeed, in the east South Central division, it is only \$107. In three Southern States the average is less than \$100, including the estimated value for rent and board as well as cash. If merely the amount expended in cash is considered, it is found that in five of the eight states which I have been discussing, the average expenditure for labor per farm reporting is considerably less than \$100.

This analysis may advantageously be carried much farther. Just as it is true that tenancy is low and the proportion of farmers employing labor very high in Massachusetts, while the reverse is true in Mississippi, so, too, just as tenancy is comparatively low among the white farmers and high among the Negroes, the proportion of white farmers who employ labor is high, while the reverse is true of Negro farmers. About 40 per cent. of the white farmers report expenditures for labor and only 27.6 per cent. of the Negro farmers. Just as the farmer in Massachusetts who employs labor has a much higher average expenditure than is shown for Mississippi, so, too, the expenditure per farm of white farmers averages \$139, while that of Negro farmers averages only \$58.

What of the future? As more land is brought into farms and as more farm land is improved, will the number of these small farms increase? Will the average farm grow still smaller, and the result be an increase in number of farm-families? If the small farm is to continue, will it be operated by tenants or owners? Is the rapid upward movement of land values to result in a slower increase of small ownership and gradually make it impracticable? And, with the upward movement of land values, will the introduction of larger machines for preparing the soil, for planting, cultivating, and picking or harvesting the crops mean larger fields? Will this in turn demand diversified cultivation in order to conserve the resources and supply the people with more goods for home use,

and, therefore, mean larger farms? If higher land values, larger farms, diversified and operated with larger and more economic machines come, must the cabins be moved back and the fields be cleared and combined? And if this happens, must tenants give way to hired labor? With hired labor must the planter return to the farm in order to make more effective the necessary supervision? Will he the more willingly return because of the extremely high cost of living in the cities, and the fact that he may now have good roads, automobiles, telephones, rural mail, parcels post, cold storage, and fresh and cheap materials for home use?

The attempt on the part of the Census Bureau to make a clean-cut study of the present status of the plantation should make it possible to answer some, if not all, of these questions, and many others not considered here.

TABLE II.
F FARMS IN CERTAIN SOUTHERN STATES CLASSIFIED BY SIZE.

States.	Year.	All Farms.	Classification by Size.						
			Under 3 Acres.	3 to 9 Acres.	10 to 19 Acres.	20 to 49 Acres.	50 to 99 Acres.	100 to 499 Acres.	500 to 999 Acres.
Total for the group.									
1910.....	1,947,684	1,322	116,387	244,489	656,289	428,132	474,001	20,407	6,657
1900.....	1,675,882	8082	84,013	176,903	503,359	376,085	492,500	24,184	7,856
1890.....	1,247,304	(1)	55,664	111,073	327,923	261,125	449,995	32,711	11,913
1880.....	1,078,555	1,491	42,943	100,444	251,324	221,767	408,811	37,266	14,309
Kentucky.									
1910.....	259,185	315	21,777	33,380	58,537	65,778	76,773	2,181	444
1900.....	234,667	1,175	14,960	26,769	51,850	60,335	74,818	2,470	558
1890.....	179,264	(1)	8,718	13,609	31,560	46,301	74,818	3,330	928
1880.....	166,453	313	6,759	13,728	30,673	40,394	69,472	3,802	1,112
Tennessee.									
1910.....	246,012	143	14,713	32,855	72,212	60,105	63,995	1,878	481
1900.....	224,623	1,123	16,402	25,517	61,442	57,265	66,750	2,058	566
1890.....	174,412	(1)	6,844	15,337	37,074	43,328	68,076	3,046	807
1880.....	165,650	220	5,821	17,335	34,783	39,941	63,315	3,549	1,086
Virginia.									
1910.....	184,018	227	17,464	22,055	42,390	38,342	59,098	3,450	902
1900.....	167,386	1,671	12,398	12,334	35,644	33,448	60,191	4,100	1,100
1890.....	127,600	(1)	8,284	11,566	21,708	24,867	54,903	5,077	1,395
1880.....	118,517	101	7,012	9,663	19,322	22,194	53,101	5,561	1,563
North Carolina.									
1910.....	253,725	116	14,863	28,240	75,929	62,157	69,241	2,669	805
1900.....	224,637	1,202	11,323	20,559	59,013	55,028	72,288	3,275	949
1890.....	178,559	(1)	8,768	14,923	41,926	40,310	67,116	4,518	1,468
1880.....	157,609	277	7,273	13,314	31,148	34,007	61,806	5,063	1,721
South Carolina.									
1910.....	176,434	53	14,218	23,714	70,582	33,147	31,966	1,942	812
1900.....	155,355	1,193	13,075	18,828	54,384	29,944	34,607	2,314	1,010
1890.....	115,008	(1)	8,551	14,907	39,052	17,941	20,347	3,083	1,327
1880.....	93,864	118	7,035	12,519	27,517	13,612	27,735	3,093	1,635
Georgia.									
1910.....	291,027	98	8,602	13,301	73,408	52,251	73,100	4,718	1,858
1900.....	224,691	451	5,604	4,438	55,287	32,316	59,343	6,061	2,758
1890.....	171,071	(1)	3,110	8,694	38,524	26,054	53,035	7,017	3,491
1880.....	138,626	101	2,942	5,604	38,524	26,054	53,035	7,017	3,491
Alabama.									
1910.....	262,901	130	13,613	28,115	106,941	55,448	55,056	2,276	822
1900.....	223,220	768	10,049	20,866	80,784	47,745	59,304	2,788	956
1890.....	157,772	(1)	5,127	12,004	51,861	30,414	52,736	4,054	1,576
1880.....	135,864	277	3,597	13,055	41,721	26,447	44,254	4,645	1,868
Mississippi.									
1910.....	274,382	240	11,132	55,571	112,666	44,645	47,287	2,061	780
1900.....	220,803	499	6,242	35,529	85,834	36,669	49,810	2,461	859
1890.....	144,318	(1)	2,936	18,659	48,355	26,118	43,161	5,942	1,654
1880.....	101,772	84	2,336	11,936	26,836	19,318	35,493	3,836	1,833

(1) Not Reported Separately.

TABLE III.
AMOUNTS EXPENDED FOR LABOR BY FARMERS IN CERTAIN SOUTHERN STATES.

States.	All Farmers.				White Farmers.				Colored Farmers.									
	Amount Expended for Labor.				Amount Expended for Labor.				Amount Expended for Labor.									
	Farms Reporting. All Farms. Num- ber.	Farms Reporting. Total. Num- ber.	Cash. Per cent.	All Farms. Rent and Board.	Farms Reporting. All Farms. Num- ber.	Total. Per cent.	Cash. Per cent.	Rent and Board.	All Farms. Reporting. Num- ber.	Total. Per cent.	Cash. Per cent.	Rent and Board.						
Total for the group . . .	1,947,684	694,953	35.7	\$81,872,512	\$67,666,269	\$14,206,243	1,289,339	513,445.39	8	\$71,276,504	\$59,304,448	\$11,972,056	658,345	181,508	27.6	\$10,596,008	\$8,361,821	\$2,234,187
Kentucky . . .	171,135	91,642	35.4	\$12,243,851	\$10,007,302	\$2,236,549	217,157	89,047	36.0	\$9,803,451	\$7,194,377	\$2,190,926	11,730	2,595	22.1	\$249,474	\$203,851	\$45,623
Tennessee . . .	216,412	88,670	36.1	\$4,481,039	7,036,364	1,411,495	217,714	80,285	38.0	6,717,062	8,027,971	1,310,909	38,308	8,385	21.9	420,088	319,502	100,586
Virginia . . .	181,118	84,636	46.0	13,334,194	10,322,316	2,531,378	135,114	69,832	51.7	10,176,105	12,542,255	2,366,153	48,114	14,816	30.8	811,936	646,711	165,225
No. Carolina . . .	256,725	97,461	38.4	9,220	7,643,783	1,576,781	189,000	77,922	41.4	8,255,455	6,857,411	1,378,044	65,456	19,539	29.8	786,372	188,737	188,737
So. Carolina . . .	171,134	69,491	39.4	10,770	7,758	9,351,384	1,419,374	40,361	50.7	8,960,406	7,825,066	1,125,490	96,708	29,130	30.1	1,810,109	1,516,318	263,944
Georgia . . .	241,227	113,782	39.1	13,218,113	11,185,052	2,032,261	187,158	69,567	41.3	10,566,404	8,391,742	1,574,602	122,559	44,235	36.1	2,651,709	2,194,110	457,589
Alabama . . .	267,511	83,643	31.8	7,454,758	6,038,123	1,421,625	152,175	52,159	34.2	5,877,506	4,867,063	1,010,443	110,443	31,444	28.5	1,577,222	1,166,060	411,182
Mississippi . . .	271,582	65,628	23.9	7,162,225	5,385,445	1,576,780	107,515	34,244	31.2	5,072,037	4,056,548	1,015,489	164,737	31,384	19.1	2,090,188	1,528,897	561,291

TABLE IV.—FARM OCCUPANCY IN CERTAIN SOUTHERN STATES.

C	States.	All Farms.	Tenants.		Per Cent. of all Farms.			White Farmers.			Colored Farmers.			Per cent. of all Farms.				
			Owners.	Cash.	Share.	Tenants.		Total.	Owners.	Cash.	Share.	Tenants.	Total.	Owners.	Cash.	Share.		
						Own.	Cash.					Own.		Total.	Owners.			
Total for the group.	1910	1,947,684	960,729	\$385,990	600,965	49.3	19.8	30.9	1,289,339	\$11,494	\$143,841	334,004	658,345	149,235	\$242,149	266,961	66.2	33.8
1900	1,675,882	866,903	342,514	486,445	51.7	20.4	27.8	1,140,062	741,490	123,026	275,546	553,820	125,413	219,488	190,919	68.0	32.0	
1890	1,247,804	746,035	187,466	314,318	50.8	15.0	25.2	1,000,000	621,490	123,026	275,546	553,820	125,413	219,488	190,919	68.0	32.0	
1880	1,073,555	671,823	158,985	267,547	62.3	12.9	24.8	1,000,000	621,490	123,026	275,546	553,820	125,413	219,488	190,919	68.0	32.0	
Kentucky	1910	259,185	171,325	15,280	72,600	66.1	5.9	28.0	247,455	165,356	14,638	67,441	11,730	5,989	602	5,159	95.5	4.5
1900	179,364	134,529	14,524	60,289	67.7	7.1	25.7	223,229	152,137	15,987	55,305	11,228	5,446	789	4,984	95.2	4.8	
1890	166,453	122,426	16,824	30,211	75.0	8.1	16.9	10.1	16.3	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.1	
Tennessee	1910	246,012	144,951	29,930	71,131	58.9	12.2	28.9	207,704	134,200	18,129	55,375	38,308	10,751	11,801	15,756	84.4	15.6
1900	174,412	120,622	19,762	34,028	69.2	11.3	19.5	190,228	123,975	17,439	49,314	33,385	10,308	10,309	13,478	84.9	15.1	
1890	165,050	108,454	19,266	37,930	65.5	11.6	22.9	190,228	123,975	17,439	49,314	33,385	10,308	10,309	13,478	84.9	15.1	
Virginia	1910	184,018	135,289	14,049	34,680	73.5	7.6	18.8	135,904	102,881	9,631	23,392	48,114	32,408	4,418	11,288	73.9	26.1
1900	167,586	116,290	16,649	34,947	69.3	9.9	20.8	122,052	88,486	9,758	23,392	44,884	26,804	6,391	11,393	73.3	26.7	
1890	127,900	95,311	11,985	22,304	73.1	9.4	17.5	122,052	88,486	9,758	23,392	44,884	26,804	6,391	11,393	73.3	26.7	
1880	135,523	83,331	13,392	21,394	70.5	11.3	18.2	122,052	88,486	9,758	23,392	44,884	26,804	6,391	11,393	73.3	26.7	
North Carolina	1910	253,517	146,438	25,039	82,248	57.7	9.9	32.4	188,069	124,921	13,430	49,718	65,656	21,517	11,609	32,530	74.1	25.9
1900	224,637	131,629	19,916	73,092	55.6	8.9	32.5	169,773	113,988	9,585	46,200	54,884	17,641	10,331	26,892	75.6	24.4	
1890	178,359	117,469	10,572	50,318	65.9	5.9	28.2	169,773	113,988	9,585	46,200	54,884	17,641	10,331	26,892	75.6	24.4	
1880	157,803	104,887	8,644	44,078	66.5	5.5	28.0	169,773	113,988	9,585	46,200	54,884	17,641	10,331	26,892	75.6	24.4	
South Carolina	1910	176,334	65,213	36,255	149,438	77.9	37.0	31.9	79,636	44,710	15,625	19,301	96,798	20,503	40,630	35,665	45.1	54.9
1900	155,355	60,471	57,046	37,838	38.9	36.7	24.4	69,954	41,321	14,612	14,021	85,401	19,150	42,434	23,317	45.0	55.0	
1890	115,826	51,428	31,913	25,245	44.7	27.8	27.5	69,954	41,321	14,612	14,021	85,401	19,150	42,434	23,317	45.0	55.0	
1880	93,864	46,645	21,974	25,245	49.7	23.4	26.9	69,954	41,321	14,612	14,021	85,401	19,150	42,434	23,317	45.0	55.0	
Georgia	1910	291,127	100,047	82,387	108,563	34.4	28.3	37.3	168,468	84,226	31,908	52,334	122,559	15,821	50,479	56,259	57.9	42.1
1900	224,691	90,131	53,750	75,810	40.1	26.2	33.7	141,865	78,543	24,022	39,295	82,826	11,583	34,728	36,515	63.1	36.9	
1890	138,626	76,451	18,571	43,618	55.1	13.4	31.5	141,865	78,543	24,022	39,295	82,826	11,583	34,728	36,515	63.1	36.9	
1880	102,901	104,575	88,546	69,780	39.8	33.7	26.5	152,458	87,441	24,213	40,804	110,443	17,134	64,333	28,976	58.0	42.0	
Alabama	1910	223,220	94,346	74,230	54,544	52.3	33.3	24.4	129,137	80,164	18,118	30,865	94,088	14,182	56,212	23,089	57.9	42.1
1900	151,772	81,141	37,700	51,426	44.7	24.7	23.9	129,137	80,164	18,118	30,865	94,088	14,182	56,212	23,089	57.9	42.1	
1890	135,864	72,215	22,883	40,761	53.2	16.8	30.0	129,137	80,164	18,118	30,865	94,088	14,182	56,212	23,089	57.9	42.1	
1880	107,118	71,440	17,440	22,883	40,761	53.2	16.8	30.0	129,137	80,164	18,118	30,865	94,088	14,182	56,212	23,089	57.9	42.1
Mississippi	1910	274,382	92,891	74,524	106,967	33.9	27.2	39.0	109,645	67,759	16,247	25,132	164,727	25,132	58,277	81,328	40.0	60.0
1900	220,803	82,951	70,699	67,153	37.6	32.0	30.4	92,124	61,871	13,505	16,748	128,679	21,080	57,194	50,405	41.7	58.3	
1890	144,318	68,055	45,894	47.2	21.0	31.8	21.7	82,124	52,124	11,871	17,118	56.2	17.1	26.7	21.7	56.2	41.7	
1880	101,777	57,140	37,140	22,883	40,761	53.2	16.8	30.0	82,124	52,124	11,871	17.1	26.7	17.1	21.7	56.2	41.7	

TABLE I.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POPULATION, NUMBER OF FARMS, AND FARM ACREAGE OF CERTAIN SOUTHERN STATES FROM 1860 TO 1910.

States.	Year.	Population.	Number of Farms.		Farm Areas.						
			Total.	Per 1,000 of Population.	Total Acreage.	Improved Land.	Unimproved Land.	Per cent. of		Average per farm.	
								Land Area in Farms.	Farm Land Improved.	All Land Acres.	Improved Land Acres.
Total for the group.....	1910.....	16,802,321	1,947,684	116	163,920,835	81,025,976	82,894,859	71.6	49.4	84.2	41.6
	1900.....	14,852,398	1,675,882	113	164,281,953	75,050,633	89,231,320	71.8	45.7	98.0	44.8
(Approximate land area— 228,044,840 acres.)	1890.....	12,691,585	1,247,804	98	159,141,293	67,521,387	91,619,906	69.5	42.4	127.5	54.1
	1880.....	11,035,223	1,078,355	98	158,573,189	58,148,956	100,424,233	69.3	36.7	147.1	53.9
	1870.....	8,590,684	661,227	77	140,058,153	47,484,655	92,573,498	61.2	33.9	211.8	71.8
	1860.....	7,994,237	503,758	63	161,606,690	54,134,820	107,471,870	70.6	33.5	320.9	107.5
Kentucky.....	1910.....	2,289,905	259,185	113	22,189,127	14,354,471	7,834,656	86.3	64.7	85.6	55.4
	1900.....	2,147,174	234,667	109	21,979,422	13,741,968	8,237,454	85.5	62.5	93.7	58.6
(Approximate land area— 25,715,840 acres.)	1890.....	1,858,635	179,264	96	21,412,229	11,818,882	9,593,347	83.3	55.2	119.4	65.9
	1880.....	1,648,690	166,453	101	21,495,240	10,731,683	10,763,557	83.6	49.9	129.1	64.5
	1870.....	1,321,011	118,422	90	18,660,106	8,103,850	10,556,256	72.6	43.4	157.6	68.4
	1860.....	1,155,684	90,814	79	19,163,261	7,644,208	11,319,053	74.5	39.9	211.0	84.2
Tennessee.....	1910.....	2,184,789	246,012	113	20,041,657	10,890,484	9,151,173	75.1	54.3	81.5	44.3
	1900.....	2,020,616	224,623	111	20,342,058	10,243,950	10,096,108	76.2	50.4	90.6	45.6
	1890.....	1,767,518	174,412	99	20,161,583	9,362,555	10,799,288	75.6	46.4	115.6	53.7
(Approximate land area— 26,679,680 acres.)	1880.....	1,542,359	165,650	107	20,666,915	8,496,556	12,170,359	77.5	41.1	124.8	51.3
	1870.....	1,258,520	118,141	94	19,581,214	6,843,278	12,737,936	73.4	34.9	165.7	57.9
	1860.....	1,109,801	82,368	74	20,669,165	6,795,337	13,873,828	77.5	32.9	250.9	82.5
Virginia.....	1910.....	2,061,612	184,018	89	19,495,636	9,870,058	9,625,578	75.7	50.6	105.9	53.6
	1900.....	1,854,184	167,886	91	19,907,883	10,094,805	9,813,078	77.3	50.7	118.6	60.1
(Approximate land area— 25,767,680 acres.)	1890.....	1,655,980	127,600	77	19,104,951	9,125,545	9,979,406	74.1	47.8	149.7	71.5
	1880.....	1,512,565	118,517	78	19,835,785	8,510,113	11,325,672	77.0	42.9	167.4	71.8
	1870.....	1,225,163	73,849	60	18,145,911	8,165,040	9,980,871	70.4	45.0	245.7	110.6
	1860.....	1,219,630	62,231	51	20,220,657	9,091,694	11,128,963	78.5	45.0	324.9	146.1
North Carolina.....	1910.....	2,206,287	253,725	115	22,439,129	8,813,056	13,626,073	71.9	39.3	88.4	34.7
	1900.....	1,893,810	224,637	119	22,749,356	8,327,106	14,422,250	72.9	36.6	101.3	37.1
(Approximate land area— 31,193,600 acres.)	1890.....	1,617,949	178,359	110	22,651,896	7,828,569	14,823,237	72.6	34.6	127.0	43.9
	1880.....	1,399,750	157,609	113	22,363,558	6,481,191	15,582,367	71.7	29.0	141.9	41.1
	1870.....	1,071,361	93,565	87	19,835,410	5,258,742	14,576,668	63.6	26.5	212.0	56.2
	1860.....	992,622	75,203	76	23,762,969	6,517,284	17,245,685	76.2	27.4	316.0	86.7
South Carolina.....	1910.....	1,515,400	176,434	116	13,512,028	6,097,999	7,414,029	69.2	45.1	76.6	34.6
	1900.....	1,340,316	155,355	116	13,985,014	5,775,741	8,209,273	71.7	41.3	90.0	37.2
(Approximate land area— 19,516,800 acres.)	1890.....	1,151,149	115,008	100	13,184,652	5,255,237	7,929,457	67.6	39.9	114.6	45.7
	1880.....	995,577	93,864	94	13,457,613	4,132,050	9,325,563	69.0	30.7	143.4	44.0
	1870.....	705,606	51,889	74	12,105,280	3,010,539	9,094,741	62.0	24.9	233.3	58.0
	1860.....	703,708	33,171	47	16,195,919	4,572,060	11,623,859	83.0	28.2	488.2	137.8
Georgia.....	1910.....	2,609,121	291,027	112	26,953,413	12,298,017	14,655,396	71.7	45.6	92.6	42.3
	1900.....	2,216,331	224,691	101	26,392,057	10,615,644	15,776,413	70.2	40.2	117.5	47.2
(Approximate land area— 37,584,000 acres.)	1890.....	1,837,353	171,071	93	25,200,435	9,582,866	15,617,569	67.0	38.0	147.3	56.0
	1880.....	1,542,180	138,626	90	26,043,282	8,204,720	17,838,562	69.3	31.5	187.9	59.2
	1870.....	1,184,109	69,956	59	23,647,941	6,831,856	16,816,085	62.9	28.9	338.0	97.7
	1860.....	1,057,256	62,003	59	26,650,490	8,062,758	18,587,732	70.9	30.3	429.8	130.0
Alabama.....	1910.....	2,138,093	262,901	123	20,732,312	9,693,581	11,038,731	63.2	46.8	78.9	36.9
	1900.....	1,828,697	223,220	122	20,685,427	8,654,991	12,030,436	63.0	41.8	92.7	38.8
(Approximate land area— 32,818,560 acres.)	1890.....	1,513,401	157,772	104	19,853,000	7,698,343	12,154,657	60.5	38.8	125.8	48.8
	1880.....	1,262,505	135,864	108	18,855,334	6,375,706	12,479,628	57.5	33.8	138.8	46.9
	1870.....	996,992	67,382	68	14,961,178	5,062,204	9,898,974	45.6	33.8	222.0	75.1
	1860.....	964,201	55,128	57	19,104,545	6,385,724	12,718,821	58.2	33.4	346.5	113.8
Mississippi.....	1910.....	1,797,114	274,382	153	18,557,533	9,008,310	9,649,223	62.5	48.5	67.6	32.8
	1900.....	1,551,270	220,803	142	18,240,736	7,594,428	10,646,308	61.5	41.6	82.6	34.4
(Approximate land area— 29,671,680 acres.)	1890.....	1,289,600	144,318	112	17,572,547	6,849,390	10,723,157	59.2	39.0	121.8	47.5
	1880.....	1,131,597	101,772	90	15,855,462	5,216,937	10,638,525	53.4	32.9	155.8	51.3
	1870.....	827,922	68,023	82	13,121,113	4,209,146	8,911,967	44.2	32.1	192.9	61.9
	1860.....	791,305	42,840	54	15,839,684	5,065,755	10,773,929	53.4	32.0	369.7	118.2

TABLE V.

EXTENT OF TENANCY IN CERTAIN STATES OF THE UNITED STATES, 1910.

Percentage Groups for all Tenants.								
Under 10 Per Cent.			10 and Under 20 Per Cent.			20 and Under 30 Per Cent.		
States.	Rate.	Number of Farms.	States.	Rate.	Number of Farms.	States.	Rate.	Number of Farms.
	17,832		99,465		347,971
Connecticut	9.8	2,632	Colorado	18.2	8,390	Missouri	29.9	82,958
Arizona	9.3	861	Rhode Island	18.0	954	Maryland	29.5	14,416
Montana	8.9	2,344	Michigan	15.8	32,689	Ohio	28.4	77,188
Wyoming	8.2	897	Oregon	15.1	6,859	Florida	26.7	13,342
Massachusetts	8.1	2,979	North Dakota	14.3	10,664	Virginia	26.5	48,729
Utah	7.9	1,720	Wisconsin	13.9	24,654	New Jersey	24.8	8,294
New Hampshire	6.9	1,879	Washington	13.7	7,726	South Dakota	24.8	19,231
New Mexico	5.5	1,957	Nevada	12.4	333	Pennsylvania	23.3	51,105
Maine	4.3	2,563	Vermont	12.3	4,008	Minnesota	21.0	32,811
			Idaho	10.3	3,188	New York	20.8	44,872
						California	20.6	18,148
						West Virginia	20.5	19,335
30 and Under 40 Per Cent.			40 and Under 50 Per Cent.			Over 50 Per Cent.		
States.	Rate.	Number of Farms.	States.	Rate.	Number of Farms.	States.	Rate.	Number of Farms.
	432,543		311,262		1,139,603
District of Columbia	38.7	84	No. Carolina	42.3	107,287	Mississippi	66.1	181,491
Nebraska	38.1	49,441	Delaware	41.9	4,535	Georgia	65.6	190,980
Iowa	37.8	82,115	Illinois	41.4	104,379	So. Carolina	63.0	111,221
Kansas	36.8	65,398	Tennessee	41.1	101,061	Alabama	60.2	155,326
Kentucky	33.9	87,860				Louisiana	55.3	66,607
Indiana	30.0	64,687				Oklahoma	54.8	104,137
						Texas	52.6	219,575
						Arkansas	50.0	107,266

TABLE VI.

VALUE OF ALL FARM PROPERTY AND OF EACH CLASS, FOR SELECTED SOUTHERN STATES, 1860-1910.

States.	Year.	Values of Farm Property.			
		Total.	Land and Build- ings.	Implements and Machinery.	Live Stock.
Total for the group . . .	1910.	\$4,318,228,067	\$3,517,172,021	\$146,953,744	\$632,111,402
	1900.	2,135,185,256	1,711,115,583	84,184,655	340,854,008
	1890.	1,875,024,677	1,517,092,887	55,038,034	302,893,756
	1880.	1,485,708,860	1,210,257,782	47,557,827	227,893,271
	1870.	1,136,993,106	888,030,746	32,335,788	216,626,571
	1860.	2,048,434,496	1,653,703,879	58,489,179	336,241,438
Kentucky.	1910.	773,797,880	635,459,372	20,851,846	117,486,662
	1900.	471,045,856	382,004,890	15,301,860	73,739,106
	1890.	428,170,266	346,339,360	10,906,506	70,924,400
	1880.	358,703,832	299,298,631	9,734,634	49,670,567
	1870.	308,879,324	248,991,133	6,858,317	53,029,874
	1860.	360,839,765	291,496,955	7,474,573	61,868,237
Tennessee.	1910.	612,520,836	480,522,587	21,292,171	110,706,078
	1900.	341,202,025	265,150,750	15,232,670	60,818,605
	1890.	312,891,650	242,700,540	9,936,880	60,254,230
	1880.	259,456,170	206,749,837	9,054,863	43,651,470
	1870.	225,621,847	174,094,997	6,559,590	44,067,260
	1860.	340,036,202	271,358,985	8,465,792	60,211,425
Virginia.	1910.	625,065,383	532,058,062	18,115,883	74,891,438
	1900.	323,515,977	271,578,200	9,911,040	42,026,737
	1890.	294,488,569	254,490,600	6,593,688	33,404,281
	1880.	247,476,536	216,028,107	5,495,114	25,953,315
	1870.	196,906,040	170,416,676	3,039,229	22,550,135
	1860.	327,076,081	284,236,574	7,419,138	35,420,369
North Carolina.	1910.	537,716,210	456,624,607	18,441,619	62,649,984
	1900.	233,834,693	194,655,920	9,072,600	30,106,173
	1890.	216,707,500	183,977,010	7,183,210	25,547,280
	1880.	164,286,737	135,793,602	6,078,476	22,414,659
	1870.	83,429,729	62,568,866	3,265,689	17,595,174
	1860.	180,305,812	143,301,065	5,873,942	31,130,805
South Carolina.	1910.	392,128,314	332,888,081	14,108,853	45,131,380
	1900.	153,591,159	126,761,530	6,629,770	20,199,859
	1890.	119,849,272	99,104,600	4,172,262	16,572,410
	1880.	84,079,702	68,677,482	3,202,710	12,199,510
	1870.	47,628,175	35,847,010	1,826,357	9,954,808
	1860.	169,738,630	139,652,508	6,151,657	23,934,465
Georgia.	1910.	580,546,381	479,204,332	20,948,056	80,393,993
	1900.	228,374,637	183,370,120	9,804,010	35,200,507
	1890.	189,249,198	152,006,230	5,764,978	31,477,990
	1880.	143,158,308	111,910,540	5,317,416	25,930,352
	1870.	103,464,389	75,647,574	3,691,780	24,125,055
	1860.	202,289,924	157,072,808	6,844,387	33,372,734
Alabama.	1910.	370,138,429	288,253,591	16,290,004	65,594,834
	1900.	179,399,882	134,618,183	8,675,900	36,105,799
	1890.	146,339,765	111,051,390	4,511,645	30,776,730
	1880.	106,531,307	78,954,648	3,788,978	23,787,081
	1870.	78,172,844	54,191,229	2,629,539	21,352,076
	1860.	226,669,511	175,824,622	7,433,178	43,411,711
Mississippi.	1910.	426,314,634	334,162,289	16,905,312	75,247,033
	1900.	204,221,027	152,007,000	9,556,805	42,657,222
	1890.	167,328,457	127,423,157	5,968,865	33,936,435
	1880.	122,016,268	92,844,915	4,885,636	24,285,717
	1870.	92,890,758	65,373,261	3,565,307	23,952,190
	1870.	92,890,758	65,373,261	3,565,307	23,052,190
	1860.	241,478,571	190,760,367	8,826,512	41,891,692

TABLE VII.

AVERAGE VALUE OF ALL FARM PROPERTY AND OF EACH CLASS, FOR SELECTED SOUTHERN STATES, 1860-1910.

States.	Year.	Average Value of							
		All Property.		Land and Build- ings.		Implements and Machinery.		Live Stock.	
		Per Farm.	Per Acre.	Per Farm.	Per Acre.	Per Farm.	Per Acre.	Per Farm.	Per Acre.
Total for the group	1910 . . .	\$2,217	\$26.34	\$1,817	\$21.59	\$75	\$0.90	\$325	\$3.86
	1890 . . .	1,274	13.00	1,021	10.41	50	.51	203	2.07
	1890 . . .	1,503	11.78	1,216	9.53	44	.35	243	1.90
	1880 . . .	1,378	9.37	1,122	7.63	44	.30	211	1.44
	1870 . . .	1,720	8.12	1,343	6.34	49	.23	328	1.55
	1860 . . .	4,066	12.68	3,283	10.23	116	.36	667	2.08
Kentucky	1910 . . .	2,986	34.87	2,452	28.64	80	.94	452	5.29
	1900 . . .	2,007	21.43	1,628	17.38	65	.70	314	3.35
	1890 . . .	2,388	20.00	1,932	16.17	61	.51	395	3.31
	1880 . . .	2,155	16.69	1,798	13.92	58	.45	298	2.31
	1870 . . .	2,608	16.55	2,103	13.34	58	.37	448	2.84
	1860 . . .	3,973	18.83	3,210	15.21	82	.39	681	3.23
Tennessee	1910 . . .	2,490	30.56	1,953	23.98	87	1.06	450	5.52
	1900 . . .	1,519	16.77	1,180	13.03	68	.75	271	2.99
	1890 . . .	1,794	15.22	1,392	12.04	57	.49	345	2.99
	1880 . . .	1,566	12.55	1,248	10.00	55	.44	264	2.11
	1870 . . .	1,910	11.52	1,481	8.94	56	.33	373	2.25
	1860 . . .	4,128	16.45	3,294	13.13	103	.41	731	2.91
Virginia	1910 . . .	3,397	32.06	2,891	27.29	98	.93	407	3.84
	1900 . . .	1,927	16.25	1,618	13.64	59	.50	250	2.11
	1890 . . .	2,308	15.41	1,994	13.32	52	.35	262	1.75
	1880 . . .	2,088	12.48	1,823	10.89	46	.28	219	1.31
	1870 . . .	2,666	10.85	2,308	9.39	53	.22	305	1.24
	1860 . . .	5,256	16.18	4,567	14.06	119	.37	569	1.75
North Carolina	1910 . . .	2,119	23.96	1,800	20.35	73	.82	247	2.79
	1900 . . .	1,041	10.28	867	8.56	40	.40	134	1.32
	1890 . . .	1,215	9.57	1,031	8.12	40	.32	143	1.13
	1880 . . .	1,042	7.35	862	6.07	39	.27	142	1.00
	1870 . . .	892	4.21	669	3.15	35	.16	188	.89
	1860 . . .	2,398	7.59	1,906	6.08	178	.25	414	1.31
South Carolina	1910 . . .	2,223	29.09	1,887	24.64	80	1.04	256	3.34
	1900 . . .	989	10.98	816	9.06	43	.47	130	1.44
	1890 . . .	1,042	9.09	862	7.52	36	.32	144	1.26
	1880 . . .	896	6.25	732	5.10	34	.24	130	.91
	1870 . . .	918	3.93	691	2.96	35	.15	192	.82
	1860 . . .	5,117	10.48	4,210	8.62	185	.38	722	1.48
Georgia	1910 . . .	1,995	21.54	1,647	17.78	72	.78	276	2.98
	1900 . . .	1,016	8.65	816	6.95	44	.37	157	1.33
	1890 . . .	1,106	7.51	889	6.03	34	.23	184	1.25
	1880 . . .	1,033	5.50	807	4.30	38	.20	187	1.00
	1870 . . .	1,479	4.38	1,081	3.20	53	.16	345	1.02
	1860 . . .	3,263	7.59	2,533	5.89	110	.26	619	1.44
Alabama	1910 . . .	1,408	7.85	1,096	13.90	62	.79	250	3.16
	1900 . . .	804	8.67	603	6.51	39	.42	162	1.75
	1890 . . .	928	7.37	704	5.59	29	.23	195	1.55
	1880 . . .	784	5.65	581	4.19	28	.20	175	1.26
	1870 . . .	1,160	5.23	804	3.62	39	.18	317	1.43
	1860 . . .	4,112	11.86	3,189	9.20	135	.39	787	2.27
Mississippi	1910 . . .	1,554	22.97	1,218	18.01	62	.91	274	4.05
	1900 . . .	925	11.20	688	8.33	44	.52	193	2.34
	1890 . . .	1,159	9.52	883	7.25	41	.34	235	1.93
	1880 . . .	1,199	7.70	912	5.86	48	.31	239	1.53
	1870 . . .	1,366	7.08	961	4.98	52	.27	352	1.83
	1860 . . .	5,637	15.25	4,452	12.04	206	.56	978	2.64